Comments on Group F Lab 1 Thermal experiment.

Structure

- You could maybe make an introduction apart of the setup of the experiment. Here you jump directly from an introduction sentence to the equations and we were a bit lost in the beginning: what are you going to do and how ?
- Add a table of contents ?

Language

The report is well written and very clear.

- Write « max » and « min » fully.
- Avoid the use of formulation like « one can observe » (in the end).

Despite these minor mistakes the language is good, easy to read and to understand.

Presentation

- Figures

Plots seem to be quite hard to read at this size. Maybe you could print the paper to be sure that it is big enough ? Especially the axis. You could also add more explicit titles. What is plotted with respect to what ? Units seem to be missing on figure 4.
The schematic figures are nice and helpful (figures 1, 2) but seem a bit small too on the computer. These ones (figure 1) are also a bit small to read.
The caption of Figure 5 doesn't say that the represented curves are **average** measurements (while it is explicitly stated in the text), probably it should also be specified in the caption.

- Equations

Some of the terms in the equations (1) and (3) are not explicitly explained. While their meaning is easily understandable from the context, to explicitly state what they stand for would improve readability. In particular 'q' in equation (1) and R and T25 in equation (3).

It is not stated how variation rate is calculated.

Otherwise nice and clear presentation

Content

- Be careful to mention and comment all of your figures in the text (figure 3 for instance but it might be the only one missing)
- It is hard to understand figure 2 so a explanation of how to read it would be great.
- Some comments on the plots would be welcome. What do they tell us ? (figure 4 and 5 for instance)
- It is hard to find the face-2 line on figure 6. Is it overlapping with the face-3 line? If yes, it would worth to be mentioned.
- Nice that you have done an estimation of your measurement errors ! « interpretation part » is really nice in the fact that you tried to explain why the results are not the one expected.
- In the Error Estimation part, try to be consistent with if you want to use capital letters or not. I mean the <min> and <MAX>.
- In the same view and in addition you could maybe try to give some examples of protocols or setups that might solve the problems you encountered in the conclusion. You already say what problems should be solved but not how. That might be a bonus !
- The results on figure 8 looks weird. It looks like there is no relation between the conductances and the pressure. Additional explanation would be nice.
- Did you use any references ?

More generally for the content, the report is very well written, clear formulation and easy to read. Some more general information (how you proceed ? why you are doing that ?) might be welcome. Having a global view of the experiment is a bit hard for someone who has not read the subject or participated. But that could certainly be improved with a more detailed introduction presenting the main steps and reasons of the lab.